

**Remark**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 22 and 25 have been amended. Claims 32-35 have been previously canceled. New Claims 36-39 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-31 and 36-39 are now presented for examination.

**35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection***Epstein*

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Epstein et al., U.S. Patent 6,327,343 ("Epstein"). Looking again at Claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Epstein relates to caller information as compared to call information, but suggests that Claim 1 reads on caller information as well. Applicant maintains that the distinction between a call and a caller as described in the previous amendment is significant and that the claims are distinguished from the prior art on that basis.

The Examiner has, however, ignored other express limitations regarding voice mail ports, voice mail systems and transferring calls back and forth. Claim 1, for example, has been clarified to refer to assigning the call to a voice mail port, transferring the call and releasing the voice mail port and then to assigning the call to a voice mail port again. As mentioned in the previous remarks, Epstein does not seem to have voice mail ports and does not discuss when they should be assigned or released. Epstein describes a single server to perform all functions.

Claim 1, has also been amended to clarify that the voice mail system receives a personal selection and stores it in association with the call handle in the voice mail database. As mentioned in the previous amendment, in Epstein, the switch identifies the caller and there does not appear to be any separate information collected by a voice mail system to be stored in a voice mail database.

Finally, in Claim 1, the call that is transferred to the switch from the voice mail system is again received by the voice mail system. Applicant is unable to find any mention of such a sequence in Epstein. The processing of Epstein is exemplified by Figures 3A to 3B which flow from top to bottom and then end. There is no teaching in Epstein about what would happen if a call were to return to the voice mail system.

For these reasons, among others, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the references. The remaining claims are believed also to be allowable on these grounds, among other. The new claims further distinguish the claimed invention from Epstein.

### Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

**Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

**Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: January 4, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gordon R. Lindeen III  
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980

Docket No. 42P12314  
Application No. 09/967,108

16